

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 1, 2001

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. in the Beaverton Public Library, Meeting Room "A" at 12375 SW Fifth Street.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen, Brian Lynott and Dan Maks. Planning Commissioner Russell Davis was excused.

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, City Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley, Senior Planner Margaret Middleton, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting and emphasized that no public testimony would be accepted at the work sessions.

VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma referred to a document entitled "A Survey of Elected Officials and Planning Commissioners", which he had submitted to the Planning Commission last week. He said Planning Commission members had until August 15, 2001 to submit comments. This survey is one of three conducted by Metro. Copies of summaries of the other two surveys were submitted to the Planning Commission. They were a statistically valid survey conducted throughout the region by Davis and Hibbitts, and an internet survey of people contacted by Metro. Results of the surveys are generally consistent with one another and a survey completed in 1997. The major change is that people perceive that traffic is worse, congestion bad. Most participants viewed quality of life in the Portland Metro area as deteriorating or stable in both 1997 and 2001. Most want the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to remain at its present location.

1 Mr. Bergsma described the "Let's Talk" series of conversations with citizens that
2 Metro would like to facilitate throughout the region, observing that this would be
3 limited to small group discussions, with no more than twenty participants, on a
4 variety of issues.

5
6 Commissioner Maks expressed his concern with a skewed survey resulting from
7 the responses received from different types of households who were asked the
8 same set of questions.

9
10 Mr. Bergsma agreed that computer surveys on the internet are very skewed and
11 not scientific.

12
13 **OLD BUSINESS:**

14
15 **WORK SESSION:**

16
17 **A. TREE INVENTORY**

18 (Continued from July 11, 2001)

19 This workshop will include discussion of preliminary inventory results from the
20 field work conducted by staff and may include new inventory categories, revised
21 inventory methodology and revised timelines for completion.

22
23 Senior Planner Barbara indicated that the Commissioners have basically had the
24 information for approximately three weeks, observing that several members have
25 participated in the necessary survey work. Noting that Commissioner Bliss had e-
26 mailed and faxed information on Friday, July 27, 2001, she pointed out that
27 although this information had not been received in time to include in the packet, it
28 had been distributed. She mentioned that staff is now requesting comments on
29 several areas, including: 1) the validity of neighborhood grove concept; 2)
30 whether the inventory form that had been distributed is sufficient; and 3) any
31 comments on attached draft schedule.

32
33 Commissioner Maks discussed the adequacy of the inventory form, pointing out
34 that he approves of all that is included, although he would probably like to adjust
35 the point system methodology and functioning. He mentioned that he had
36 reviewed Groves G-16-3, G-16-5 and G-16-4, noting that he would like to award
37 a higher point value for color and variety within a grove. He pointed out that
38 Schiffler Park had a greater variety of trees and that he had given it a higher
39 rating. Observing that the stature of Grove G-16-4 Grove was more impressive,
40 he expressed his opinion that this grove should have been rated higher than Grove
41 G-16-5.

42
43 Mr. Bergsma questioned whether Commissioner Maks supports the concept of
44 neighborhood groves.

45

1 Commissioner Maks advised Mr. Bergsma that while he supports the concept of
2 neighborhood groves, he would like more weighting based on his comments.

3
4 Noting that he had missed the previous Work Session regarding the Tree
5 Inventory, Commissioner Barnard indicating that he is reserving any comments at
6 this time.

7
8 Commissioner Johansen indicated that he had been on vacation during the
9 previous Work Session regarding the Tree Inventory and that he is not totally
10 familiar with the issues.

11
12 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that he had not reviewed the issues as extensively
13 as he would have liked. He pointed out that like Commissioner Maks, he had also
14 reviewed Grove G-16-3, adding that while he approves of the current format, he
15 would weight the scores higher for native species.

16
17 Commissioner Bliss noted that he had reviewed the information and has no issue
18 with the forms, emphasizing that he had found the point spread overwhelming and
19 that he agrees with Commissioner Maks and Chairman Voytilla that it would be
20 necessary to revise the weighting numbers. Pointing out that he had studied and
21 grasped a real feeling for what had been done, he added that this could provide
22 educational benefits for young people to realize that housing and intense
23 development can occur while maintaining stream corridors and tree groves.

24
25 Observing that he had not been in attendance at the previous Work Sessions
26 regarding the Tree Inventory, Commissioner Lynott indicated that he had no
27 comments at this time.

28
29 Commissioner Maks suggested that the point system should be adjusted.

30
31 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that either the Planning Commission could direct
32 staff to adjust the point system or do it themselves, and questioned whether staff
33 has consulted with arborists regarding the ratings.

34
35 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Voytilla that staff has not consulted with arborists,
36 adding that the consultant team, which includes an arborist, could be requested to
37 review the rating issue.

38
39 Observing that he agrees regarding the native species, Commissioner Maks
40 pointed out that the native trees in one particular grove are all very large.

41
42 On question, all Commissioners supported the validity of the neighborhood grove
43 concept.

44
45 Chairman Voytilla and Commissioner Maks expressed their opinion that the draft
46 schedule is aggressive.

1
2 Ms. Fryer agreed that the draft schedule could seem aggressive, adding that staff
3 is attempting to complete this project prior to the end of the fiscal year. She
4 pointed out that the schedule is dependent upon the ability of the consultants to
5 perform the work, as well as progress by staff. She mentioned that it is important
6 that the Work Sessions and Open Houses with property owners yield further
7 information, noting that the Open Houses for the Local Wetland Inventory had
8 little public attendance until the Public Hearing.

9
10 Commissioner Maks commented that when groves of trees are identified, more
11 people would become involved – those who do want their trees identified and
12 those who do not want their trees identified.

13
14 Commissioner Barnard requested clarification of how many additional hearings
15 would be scheduled for the Tree Inventory.

16
17 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Barnard that a Work Session is scheduled for
18 August 29, 2001, adding that the first Public Hearing would be scheduled for
19 January 9, 2002.

20
21 Commissioner Maks questioned how many hearings had been held on the Local
22 Wetland Inventory.

23
24 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Maks that more than six hearings had been
25 held on the Local Wetland Inventory.

26
27 Chairman Voytilla expressed his concern with what he considers an aggressive
28 schedule, observing that we are currently behind schedule on the grant deadline.

29
30 Mr. Bergsma assured Chairman Voytilla that staff would make every effort to
31 make a great deal of progress over the next few weeks.

32
33 Ms. Fryer pointed out that staff had not received much input from the NACs,
34 adding that they had questioned the necessity of conducting this tree inventory.
35 Observing that they had acted rather ambivalent about the concept, she noted that
36 they had not identified any resources and did not indicate any desire to review the
37 maps and provide assistance. Pointing out that some had questioned the rationale
38 of this action, she stated that this inventory does not appear to be a priority for
39 them at this particular time.

40
41 Commissioner Maks emphasized that the NACs would not be concerned until the
42 trees are cut in their neighborhoods.

43
44 Commissioners Bliss and Lynott both indicated that they have faith in the efforts
45 of the staff and have no problem with the draft schedule.
46

1 **NEW BUSINESS:**

2
3 **WORK SESSION:**

4
5 **A. 2020 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN**

6 This work session on the Draft 2020 Transportation System Plan (TSP) will
7 include improvements to the bicycle, pedestrian, transit and vehicle circulation
8 systems that are necessary to keep the transportation system functioning at
9 acceptable levels through forecast year 2020.

10
11 Senior Planner Margaret Middleton presented the 2020 Transportation System
12 Plan, updating and identifying overall necessary improvements to the 2015
13 Transportation System Plan. The 2015 TSP was also prepared by Randy
14 McCourt, consultant for *DKS & Associates, Inc.*, and adopted in the Fall of 1999.
15 She mentioned that this plan basically indicates the necessity of additional lanes,
16 bike lanes and sidewalks for adequate functioning of the transportation circulation
17 system. She pointed out that staff has been working with Metro since 1996 to
18 understand the region's transportation needs for the management of congestion
19 over the next twenty years. Observing that the currently adopted 2015
20 Transportation System Plan is consistent with the Regional Plan adopted by
21 Metro last August, she added that while staff had been able to fit all of the
22 required improvements into this plan, it is necessary to update the local program
23 to be consistent with the Regional Plan through the year 2020.

24
25 Noting that the update process began in November of 2000, Ms. Middleton
26 mentioned that staff had been meeting with Traffic Commission on a regular basis
27 and had also provided several open houses with the public. She pointed out that a
28 Transportation System Plan Technical Advisory Committee had been created,
29 consisting of neighboring and interested agencies throughout the region.
30 Observing that tonight's focus is on the difference between the 2015 and 2020
31 Transportation Plans, she stated that staff would like the Commission's comments
32 on the draft that they had received. She noted that the City Council has already
33 received copies of this plan, which will be reviewed in a work session on August
34 13, 2001, at which time staff anticipates that they will receive some direction on
35 the implementation of the 2020 Transportation System Plan. She stated that in the
36 Fall of 2001, staff would be developing the implementing amendments to the
37 Comprehensive Plan, Development Code and Design Manual, followed by a
38 Measure 56 Notice in the Winter of 2001 for the Planning Commission Public
39 Hearing and adoption of the 2020 Transportation System Plan implementing
40 amendments.

41
42 Ms. Middleton mentioned that the Staff Report highlights the differences between
43 the two plans and provides documentation of the public comments received to
44 date and the Traffic Commission Minutes. She added that this updated plan
45 includes updated goals and policies and an updated circulation system with a
46 larger study area, which expands the study area boundary to the County line on

1 the east and over to 185th Avenue to the west and above US Highway 26 on the
2 north, although the southern boundary remains about the same. She pointed out
3 that the new plan expands the bicycle and pedestrian systems, in order to
4 incorporate the improvements in the new study boundaries and adds Tri-Met's
5 new ten-year transit plan, which was incorporated into the Regional
6 Transportation Plan and includes transportation demand management policies and
7 strategies that will be addressed over the next twenty years. . She emphasized
8 that the 2020 TSP mainly concentrates on the differences between the years 2015
9 and 2020 on the motor vehicle system, adding that Randy McCourt, consultant for
10 *DKS & Associates, Inc.*, will provide a brief presentation addressing these issues,
11 after which time they would both respond to comments and questions.

12
13 Observing that he is aware of this evening's goal, Commissioner Maks questioned
14 when had the bound draft copy of the Transportation System Plan Update become
15 available.

16
17 Ms. Middleton advised Commissioner Maks that the Transportation System Plan
18 Update had been available since June 29, 2001, adding that it had also been
19 provided on the City's website.

20
21 Emphasizing that he had only received this document on the evening of Monday,
22 July 30, 2001, Commissioner Maks pointed out that he has not had the
23 opportunity to review the information, adding that he does not know what kind of
24 comments Ms. Middleton expects at this point. He mentioned that the last update
25 had been received three or four weeks in advance, noting that he has read the Staff
26 Report, but not the plan.

27
28 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that he is in a similar situation, noting that he had
29 only recently received this information as well.

30
31 Ms. Middleton informed the Commission that the staff could gather whatever
32 comments they do have at this time.

33
34 Commissioner Maks reiterated that it is necessary to have adequate time to read
35 and review the information.

36
37 Expressing his concern with doing the best possible decisions based on all
38 necessary resources, Chairman Voytilla indicated that he feels forced to attempt
39 to digest as much information as possible at the last minute.

40
41 Ms. Middleton apologized for the delay in the Commissioners receiving the
42 report.

43
44 Chairman Voytilla stated that this system is not effective, adding that the end
45 result would be based on how well information has been reviewed, emphasizing
46 that this large amount of information needs critical review, which cannot be

1 accomplished in such a short time. Observing that he is not in a position to
2 comment at great length at this point, he suggested that the consultant's
3 presentation be brief.
4

5 **RANDY McCOURT**, consultant representing *DKS & Associates, Inc.*, described
6 the process identified from the plans for the years 2015 and 2020, adding that the
7 more recent study incorporates a lot more study area and projects. He mentioned
8 that the plan outlines and identifies a handful of new projects, some intersections,
9 and roadway linkages. He pointed out that the goals and policies highlighted in
10 the Regional Transportation Plan would be brought into conformance with the
11 City's plan, adding that this does not include many changes. He discussed
12 substantial additions to the transportation demand management section, adding
13 that this includes a great deal more discussion, background documentation and
14 tools for evaluation. He mentioned that the basic objective is to review the key
15 streets, adding that he would like to walk through a series of these issues.
16

17 Mr. McCourt pointed out that one of the major issues involves Scholl's Ferry
18 Road, adding that seven lanes had been previously identified. With a more
19 detailed analysis of the corridor and more analytical tools currently available, the
20 projected needs for Scholls Ferry look a little different. He mentioned that some
21 of the improvements in the Washington Square Regional Center also change the
22 picture. He indicated that while the extension of the seven lanes further west
23 might not be necessary at this time, this might be inevitable at some future point.
24 He discussed the thresholds for capacity or service and the potential for the
25 development of vacant land, adding that adequate right-of-way needs to be readily
26 available and in place.
27

28 Mr. McCourt discussed the alignment of Davies Road with Barrows Road (the old
29 Scholl's Ferry Road).
30

31 Requesting a more specific location, Chairman Voytilla pointed out that Scholls
32 Ferry Road bisects the entire area.
33

34 Mr. McCourt indicated the correct location on the map, observing that he is
35 referring to the portion of Barrows Road west of 135th Avenue. The
36 neighborhood has expressed concern with connecting Davies Road and Barrows
37 Road and potentially increasing traffic through the Davies neighborhood. He
38 discussed the rationale for opening up this intersection, which he referred to as a
39 policy directive more than a physical change, including the location of
40 substandard access, queuing problems, and adequate safety and performance
41 levels at the existing intersection of Barrows Road with Scholls Ferry Road. He
42 mentioned the timing of that improvement crossing the creek to Barrows Road
43 versus the improvement of Walnut Street and Murray Boulevard traveling south,
44 emphasizing that the key concern is to make certain that the Davies/Barrows
45 Extension should not occur prior to the Walnut Street/Murray Boulevard

1 improvement. He pointed out that there had been a clear distinction that
2 sequencing the projects properly is a key issue.

3
4 Mr. McCourt referred to the 2015 Transportation System Plan, observing that
5 Hart Road is a collector route running east and west and Allen Boulevard to Davis
6 Road is an arterial route running east and west. He pointed out that an evaluation
7 of the sections of these two routes between Murray Boulevard and 185th Avenue
8 had clearly indicated that connectivity, and it resulted in a recommendation to
9 change which facility would be considered the collector route and which would be
10 considered the arterial route. He pointed out that the primary intent is to bring the
11 plan more into conformance with the reality of the situation.

12
13 Mr. McCourt described the issue regarding Jay Street, adding that Washington
14 County had made plans with *Sequent* and *IBM*, noting that they had
15 recommended, sought and obtained approval of a vacation of Jay Street, which
16 connects 158th Avenue to Jenkins Street by the *Nike* and *Sequent* campuses. He
17 pointed out that members of the Traffic Commission had expressed concern that
18 this key bypass route should remain intact.

19
20 Mr. McCourt discussed the status of bicycle lanes and connectivity in the area
21 between Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway and Canyon Road, adding that there had
22 been concern that the likelihood of bike lanes and the widening of those roads are
23 not realistic. He pointed out that a roadway around 103rd Avenue has a greater
24 potential to service this area.

25
26 Commissioner Maks requested clarification of what is located around 103rd
27 Avenue.

28
29 Mr. McCourt advised Commissioner Maks that *Familian Northwest*, the *Kaiser*
30 *Medical Center*, and a furniture warehouse are located in this area, on the
31 southwestern corner of the western intersection of Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway.
32 He pointed out that for this road to effectively come into existence, it would be
33 necessary to implement a slight realignment, requiring a right-of-way acquisition,
34 to connect 103rd Avenue to Western Avenue, adding that the intersection would
35 not be offset as it currently is. He further clarified that a right-of-way would have
36 to be dedicated, over time, with redevelopment, on certain parts of the right-of-
37 way. He mentioned that at its mid-point span, approximately halfway between
38 Canyon Road and Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, a parking lot where 103rd
39 Avenue jogs and there is a church parking lot, access would have to be created to
40 make that roadway happen. Observing that there would be some elevation
41 changes, he noted that these could be addressed from an engineering standpoint.

42
43 Commissioner Maks mentioned that there is good connectivity with Western
44 Avenue across from *Target*.

45

1 Observing that this had been considered, Mr. McCourt pointed out that because
2 this is not a major arterial, two lanes are more than adequate. He discussed
3 comments on whether or not to widen Walker Road to seven lanes, adding that it
4 had been determined that the existing five lanes are adequate and necessary,
5 although improvements need to be made
6

7 Mr. McCourt discussed the Cambry Drive connection between Walker Road and
8 185th Avenue, noting that there had been concern that development as a straight
9 through route would become a cut-through route that would be detrimental to the
10 neighborhood. He mentioned that several of the neighbors felt that although
11 connectivity is important, this should not be developed as a through route.
12

13 Mr. McCourt referred to the issue involving 173rd Avenue and 170th Avenue,
14 north of Merlo Road approximately to Walker Road, noting that historically this
15 roadway has been included in the Washington County Transportation Plan and
16 has been scheduled for a jog alignment. It had been suggested that both 170th
17 Avenue and 173rd Avenue be kept open as a couplet. He mentioned that
18 operationally, several issues do become clear. South of Baseline Road, the
19 suggested extension of 173rd Avenue would involve a new gate crossing the light
20 rail tracks, noting that this creates a gridlock-type position. Referring to the
21 existing grading problems, he mentioned that several possible configurations have
22 been reviewed, adding that like Walker Road, the result has been a full circle,
23 with the issue back where it started.
24

25 Observing that he had described the most significant of the discussions that had
26 occurred, Mr. McCourt referred to a graphic of improvements on pages 1-32
27 through 1-37. He mentioned that the proposed street improvements have been
28 identified, as well as most turn lane adjustments, adding that the most significant
29 identified is the Tualatin Valley Highway corridor from Millikan Road to south of
30 Farmington Road. He pointed out that there would be improved access control in
31 that corridor, adding that the substantial project remains far out in the planning
32 stages.
33

34 Mr. McCourt described two other significant projects, one on Cornell Boulevard
35 near the Cedar Mill area, for five lanes, and another extending a project on
36 Bethany Road south to Cornell Road. He observed that the Transportation
37 System Plan had allowed two things to occur, to allow the individual peak hour
38 level of service and volume/capacity ratios to increase. He pointed out that
39 although this is difficult to administer, in terms of calculations and monitoring,
40 this had been the best balance between livability and financial fiscal
41 responsibility. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.
42

43 Commissioner Barnard expressed concern with funding and questioned whether
44 99% of this plan could be considered a pipe dream.
45

1 Mr. McCourt advised Commissioner Barnard that he does not consider this a pipe
2 dream, pointing out that a substantial transportation funding shortfall needs to be
3 addressed at some point and that many different funding sources are available.
4 He mentioned that a great deal of the funding must be absorbed by Oregon
5 Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Washington County, adding that
6 although the funding is in place, the City of Beaverton does not control the actual
7 cash flow.

8
9 Chairman Voytilla requested clarification of the study in relationship to other
10 jurisdictions and other planning elements, specifically the City of Hillsboro and
11 Washington Square and how they relate to these projections.

12
13 Advising Chairman Voytilla that good participation had been received from each
14 of the cities, Mr. McCourt pointed out that the forecasting focuses on Beaverton,
15 but includes Tigard, Hillsboro, the Portland region and all of Washington County.
16 He mentioned that this forecast had been based upon anticipated employment,
17 housing, and retail development for the year 2020.

18
19 Referring to expectations of the public, Chairman Voytilla requested specific
20 clarification of what the public is willing to expect as well as what they want. He
21 emphasized that it has become a real issue for people to be late due to traffic
22 problems.

23
24 Commissioner Maks questioned where he could find an E/F level of service
25 across a two-hour p.m. peak period, emphasizing that this could possibly be found
26 in Los Angeles and Seattle, and possibly San Francisco.

27
28 Ms. Middleton advised Commissioner Maks that she does not believe that the
29 meaning of E/F has been specifically integrated at this time, adding that the fact
30 that she has not received a lot of questions regarding this issue is a potential
31 indication that this has not yet been addressed.

32
33 Commissioner Maks emphasized that he is speaking from the standpoint of Joe
34 Sixpack in Beaverton.

35
36 Chairman Voytilla clarified that his concern involves what works best for the
37 citizens of Beaverton.

38
39 Mr. McCourt pointed out that while people can rationalize receiving the full use
40 out of a facility, they can not rationalize letting it go beyond that point,
41 emphasizing that there is a large difference between level of service E and level of
42 service F.

43
44 Chairman Voytilla emphasized that he is concerned with citizen expectations of
45 public officials and staff.

46

1 Commissioner Maks pointed out that the number one issue that concerns every
2 neighborhood is traffic calming, noting that the public is not happy with the
3 current intersection. He mentioned that increasing the level of service to E/F
4 involves lowering the standards, expressing his opinion that this is not acceptable.
5 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that he is not hearing conclusively that knowledge
6 is available of what type of road service is expected by the residents of the City of
7 Beaverton.

8
9 Mr. McCourt mentioned that a balancing act is going on.

10
11 Ms. Middleton indicated that she has not, to her knowledge, received any
12 comments regarding these expectations.

13
14 Mr. McCourt expressed his opinion that because they had not approved the gas
15 tax a year ago in order to improve those roadways, the public is not that outraged
16 at the situation.

17
18 Commissioner Maks commented that this discussion should not involve politics.

19
20 Mr. McCourt emphasized that if this situation was such an issue to the public, it
21 would be at the top of their agenda.

22
23 Chairman Voytilla expressed his opinion that the two issues are not connected
24 with one another.

25
26 Commissioner Johansen discussed the importance of measuring the public's
27 acceptance of the 2020 Transportation System Plan Update. He pointed out that
28 with increased density, there should be better transit service and more livable
29 communities, adding that level of service E/F had not been mentioned.

30
31 Mr. McCourt pointed out that people react to needs and resources, observing that
32 this issue has not been fully addressed at this time.

33
34 Chairman Voytilla emphasized his concern with considering the benefit of the
35 citizens of Beaverton and meeting their expectations. Observing that there is a
36 great potential for right-of-way acquisitions, he pointed out that this would
37 involve a great deal of money.

38
39 Ms. Middleton mentioned that Metro's function is being fulfilled to the degree
40 included within the public's comments.

41
42 Commissioner Maks discussed the proposed level of service drop, pointing out
43 that this would effectively cause drivers to cut through neighborhoods.

44
45 Commissioner Johansen commended Ms. Middleton for the format providing
46 citizen comment in the Staff Report.

1 Mr. McCourt discussed what he referred to as state of the art technology relating
2 to land use densities and service coverage, observing that they are now
3 developing technology that addresses frequency of service in same type of
4 fashion, adding another quantifier. He pointed out that ridership level and
5 acceptable transit service is also being addressed, as well as density and quarter of
6 a mile access to a bus stop.

7
8 Commissioner Maks pointed out that it takes his daughter an hour and ten minutes
9 to get from the intersection of Brockman Road and Murray Boulevard to City
10 Hall by transit.

11
12 Mr. McCourt emphasized that coverage and frequency of service are separate
13 issues.

14
15 Commissioner Maks pointed out that there is a bus stop located near his home.

16
17 Commissioner Barnard mentioned that having a bus stop does not necessarily
18 indicate good service.

19
20 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that there are some major
21 deficiencies in the system.

22
23 Mr. McCourt pointed out that connectivity is a major issue.

24
25 Commissioner Maks agreed, observing that there is now more of a cut-through
26 issue, adding that this had been brought up in the 2015 discussion. He requested
27 clarification of where this issue is addressed within the policy of the current
28 document.

29
30 Ms. Middleton advised Commissioner Maks that this issue is not addressed within
31 the current policy.

32
33 Commissioner Johansen referred to Davis Road and Hart Road, expressing his
34 opinion that deletion of the Jay Street connection is a bad idea.

35
36 Referring to the coordination of traffic signals, Commissioner Lynott requested
37 clarification of the difference between the ITS and TSM systems.

38
39 Mr. McCourt advised Commissioner Lynott that ITS refers to Intelligent
40 Transportation System, generally utilizing technology, primarily data systems and
41 video equipment out on the street to get greater performance out of a system,
42 while TSM indicates Transportation System Management, which is generally
43 low-cost improvements to intersections, such as turn lanes.

44
45 Commissioner Lynott requested clarification of whether Mr. McCourt is referring
46 to the difference between a stop sign and a traffic signal.

1
2 Mr. McCourt informed Commissioner Lynott that he is referring to a signal
3 versus using video detection to pick up extended queues for the purpose of
4 shortening the queues. He pointed out that some work on a cooperative basis
5 while others have delegated authority.

6
7 Observing that they do not appear to be properly coordinated with one another,
8 Commissioner Lynott questioned whether the traffic signals are timed incorrectly.

9
10 Mr. McCourt expressed his opinion that ODOT, Washington County and the City
11 of Beaverton do an adequate job of working cooperatively to address this issue.
12 He pointed out that signal timing involves many dynamics, from a day-to-day
13 basis, adding that Allen Boulevard provides a good example where the timing
14 differs at different times. He mentioned that over time, construction changes and
15 traffic changes, with the result that signal timing requires changes as well.

16
17 On question, Commissioner Bliss indicated that he had nothing to add at this time.

18
19 Commissioner Barnard mentioned that while he is amazed at the proposed 2020
20 Plan, he sees no significant growth, although these roads are full today.

21
22 Mr. McCourt provided what he referred to as a quick synopsis, observing that
23 there are areas that Commissioner Barnard may be unaware of. He pointed out
24 that 170th is being developed, adding that some of that construction is currently
25 underway towards converting this corridor from two to five lanes.

26
27 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that 170th Avenue north of Tualatin Valley
28 Highway is not funded at this time.

29
30 Noting that houses south of Tualatin Valley Highway are currently being
31 acquired, Mr. McCourt pointed out that some of the necessary pieces have not yet
32 received funding.

33
34 Chairman Voytilla expressed his opinion that some accidents are the direct result
35 of frustration due to the length of time spent waiting at traffic signals, and
36 expressed concern that there is no specific plan for Tualatin Valley Highway.

37
38 Mr. McCourt assured Chairman Voytilla that there is a plan for Tualatin Valley
39 Highway.

40
41 Chairman Voytilla questioned where the funding would come from for Tualatin
42 Valley Highway.

43
44 Mr. McCourt advised Chairman Voytilla that funding for this project is
45 anticipated at some future point.

46

1 Chairman Voytilla observed that there is a serious problem on this highway at this
2 time and that this issue needs to be addressed now, adding that this would not
3 meet current expectations.

4

5 Mr. McCourt pointed out that several east/west corridors and arterials are being
6 addressed at this time, including Baseline Road, Jenkins Road and Walker Road.

7

8 Commissioner Maks expressed concern with the level of service on Scholls Ferry
9 Road during the a.m. peak period.

10

11 Mr. McCourt mentioned that this area is being upgraded.

12

13 Commissioner Maks described the traffic at this location during the a.m. peak
14 period, observing that it involves what he referred to as an open bottle-neck,
15 queued all the way back, adding that opening up the bottle-neck would not solve
16 the problem.

17

18 Mr. McCourt observed that there is a huge list of necessary improvements, adding
19 that these would be funded as funding becomes available. Noting that the TSP
20 shows that most major intersections need additional turn lanes, he mentioned that
21 this is the most cost-effective and quickest available option for change.

22

23 Commissioner Maks emphasized that the Planning Commission's hands should
24 not be tied, adding that if a developer proposes a development that would turn the
25 level of service on a street into an E/F, the Commission should have the authority
26 to make this developer pay for the improvements necessitated by this
27 development. He pointed out that these necessary improvements could include
28 right-of-way, half street improvements and turn lanes, expressing his opinion that
29 lowering standards is not justified. He discussed the use of public transit in
30 Washington County, pointing out that many of those who utilize this service drive
31 to one of the park and rides rather than riding the bus to the light rail. Observing
32 that he would like to take advantage of the light rail more often, he emphasized
33 that this is not feasible until Tri-Met makes some major changes.

34

35 On question, Mr. McCourt advised Commissioner Maks that in the 1980's, the
36 Highway Capacity Manual had based the intersection delays on stop delays. He
37 pointed out that the latest manual had indicated that stop delays do not provide the
38 total picture and that an overall picture is necessary, which basically resulted in
39 several adjustments. He mentioned that the total delay is now measured,
40 including the delay caused by intersection queuing.

41

42 Commissioner Maks referred to page 1-36 of the draft 2020 TSP, specifically
43 referencing the financial versus social costs, which must be watched closely. He
44 also discussed traffic calming issues, and questioned why this can't be achieved.

45

46 Mr. McCourt pointed out that it is necessary to stay at a certain level of service.

1 Commissioner Maks discussed the issue of concurrency on a route, observing that
2 this sometimes appears too restrictive.

3

4 Mr. McCourt pointed out that it had been determined that full-capacity utilization
5 provides the best balance between what is physically feasible and what can be
6 expected to happen. He expressed his opinion that once a certain threshold level
7 of service is achieved, there would be no further significant changes.

8

9 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that there appears to be a
10 consensus that anything below a certain level of congestion is livable,
11 emphasizing that the issue is more complicated than that. He pointed out that just
12 because a system has not totally failed does not indicate that the situation is
13 livable.

14

15 Noting that this is a good observation, Mr. McCourt expressed his opinion that
16 this issue is not simply black and white and that there is a great deal of gray area.

17

18 Commissioner Maks pointed out that the key to this issue, in his opinion, is at
19 what point drivers start cutting through the neighborhoods.

20

21 Mr. McCourt emphasized that a Citywide Neighborhood Traffic Management
22 Plan is not in place to avert, obscure, stop or hinder the development of a good
23 arterial system, adding that a functioning arterial system itself creates less
24 problems and that there is a direct correlation between the two.

25

26 Observing that we are currently at a level of service D, Commissioner Maks
27 emphasized that it might be possible to require a developer to install a right-hand
28 turn lane to maintain this level of service. He pointed out that while either a D or
29 an E could prove too costly or major in scope, if a developer doesn't have to make
30 this improvement, standards have been compromised.

31

32 On question, Ms. Middleton indicated that she had no further comments at this
33 time.

34

35 Expressing his appreciation for the efforts of Mr. McCourt and Ms. Middleton,
36 City Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley pointed out that they had worked
37 very hard to prepare this plan on time. The failure to deliver the plan to the
38 Planning Commission on time occurred elsewhere in the system.

39

40 On question, Chairman Voytilla advised Commissioner Maks that the timeline
41 prepared by staff indicates that this issue is currently scheduled for a City Council
42 Work Session.

43

44 Ms. Middleton indicated that scheduling changes are feasible.

45

1 Observing that the Planning Commission is not scheduled to review this plan
2 further, Chairman Voytilla reiterated that he would have preferred to receive this
3 information at an earlier time in order to make recommendations to the City
4 Council. Noting that the Commission could attempt to make some progress
5 between now and then, he pointed out that they would not be meeting formally as
6 a body to review this issue.

7
8 Pointing out that the public has made some great comments with regard to the
9 policies within this plan, Commissioner Maks stated that he would like to delay
10 the City Council Work Session to allow for submittal of comments by the
11 Planning Commission.

12
13 Chairman Voytilla questioned the possibility of modifying the timeline, noting
14 that the next two Planning Commission sessions are committed to Work Sessions
15 regarding the Development Code Update.

16
17 Mr. Wooley suggested a different approach to resolving this issue, noting that Mr.
18 McCourt had provided information regarding the highlights and key issues of the
19 plan, expressing his opinion that the feedback that had been received had
20 provided sufficient information for staff to discuss the issues with the City
21 Council at their Work Session. He also suggested scheduling a session regarding
22 future implementation of the plan, at which time more feedback could be received
23 from the Planning Commission. He expressed his opinion that there should be no
24 problem with presenting this plan to the City Council in two weeks prior to
25 receiving more detailed comments from the Planning Commission.

26
27 Chairman Voytilla questioned the feasibility of an additional Planning
28 Commission Work Session on this issue prior to Fall 2001.

29
30 Emphasizing that the public has difficulty commenting on a moving target,
31 Commissioner Maks indicated that another Work Session would be necessary.

32
33 Noting that the plan is still in the development stages, Ms. Middleton suggested
34 that another Work Session be scheduled following completion of the final draft
35 plan, which would be based upon the comments of everyone involved. On
36 question, she advised Commissioner Johansen that a verbal update would be
37 provided for the benefit of the City Council. She also advised Chairman Voytilla
38 that the City Council would receive copies of the minutes of this Work Session.

39
40 Commissioner Johansen suggested that the City Council should also receive a
41 Memorandum providing more information than would be available in the
42 minutes.

43
44 Commissioner Maks expressed his appreciation to Ms. Middleton for preparing a
45 good Staff Report.

46

1 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

2
3 Minutes of the meeting of June 6, 2001, submitted. Commissioner Maks
4 **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
5 approved as written.

6
7 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioners Barnard
8 and Johansen, who abstained from voting on this issue.

9
10 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

11
12 Chairman Voytilla questioned whether any information is available regarding the
13 schedule for the restoration of the portions of City Hall that were damaged by the
14 fire.

15
16 Mr. Wooley indicated that the contractors and insurance companies had
17 determined what would be covered, adding that a Project Manager has been
18 retained and the restoration would be proceeding, with the City Council Chambers
19 to be the first area to be restored.

20
21 Observing that Wednesdays are very busy at the library, Chairman Voytilla noted
22 that with school starting, parking problems at the library would increase.

23
24 Mr. Wooley commented that it is anticipated that the Council Chambers
25 restoration would be complete in September.

26
27 Emphasizing that Code Review starts with next week's Work Session,
28 Commissioner Maks requested that his fellow Commissioners read the
29 information diligently, adding that this code provides the documentation from
30 which decisions must be made. He suggested comparing the new sections to the
31 existing sections to determine what has been deleted and added.

32
33 Chairman Voytilla requested that the Recording Section find out if an edited
34 version of the document is available, including strikeouts and bolded and
35 underlined sections of the text.

36
37 Chairman Voytilla emphasized that Commissioners should come well prepared,
38 noting that this session would be a discussion of the concepts, rather than a word-
39 smithing session.

40
41 The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.